Amount Claimed Under Interest Subsidy Scheme for Riot Victims

*279. SHRI KANAKSINH MOHANSINH MANGROLA:
SHRI PASUMPON THA KIRUTTINAN:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstar-red Question No. 2022 given in the Rajya Sabha on 20th December, 1994 and state:

(a) the amount of subsidy claimed under the scheme for November, 1984 riot victims upto 31st July, 1995 by all the nationalised banks, SBI and its sub sidiaries, individually;

(b) whether Reserve Bank of India has conducted a special check into the claims of Punjab and Sind Bank, if so, the outcome thereof and if not, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the number of riot victims on whose behalf the amount of Rs.877.69 lakh has been claimed by Punjab and Sind Bank, indicating the amount claimed in each case?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHARA MURTHY): (a) As per information provided by the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) the amount of subsidy claimed upto 31st July, 1995 under the Central Interest Subsidy Scheme (Revised) for November, 1984 Riot Affected Borrowers by nationalised banks, State Bank of India and its subsidiaries are given in statement *(see* below)

(b) No. Sir. As per the Central Intrest Subsidy Scheme (Revised) for November, 1984 Riot Affected Borrowers, the banks are required to submit an audit certificate from an auditor to the effect that the entries in the relevant books and the claims made by the banks in respect of the subsidy claimed are correct. Primafacie scrutiny is done by RBI with a view to see that the various claims are in accordance with the scheme.

(c) The number of riot affected borrowers on whose behalf the amount of Rs.877.69 lakh has been claimed by Punjab & Sind Bank, is 667. The time and labour involved in prepering details of the amount claimed in each case may not be commensurate with the results to be achieved.

Statement

The amount of subsidy claimed upto 31st July, 1995 under the Central InterestSubsidy Scheme (Revised) for November 1984 Riot Affected Borrowers by the nationalisedbanks,State Bank of India and its subsidiaries

1.	Dena Bank	16,13,893.42
2.	Vijaya Bank	3,78,093.07
3.	Indian Overseas Bank	69,69,025.48
4.	Corporation Bank	7,38,886.40
5.	Oriental Bank of Commerce	33,35,602.36
6.	Syndicate Bank	66,56,604.42
7.	Andhra Bank	9,05,915.11
8.	Punjab & Sind Bank	8,40,76,943.51
9.	Allahabad Bank	25,05,023.84
10.	Bank of India	2,86,53,415.88
11.	Punjab National Bank	3,31,49,198.49
12.	United Bank of India	23,97,871.81

13.	Canara Bank	3,36,03,569.97
14.	Bank of Maharashtra	5,63,219.29
15.	Union Bank of India	1,00,25,150.26
16.	Indian Bank	10,12,494.22
17.	Bank of Baroda	1,03,31,010.31
18.	Central Bank of India	91,95,244.00
19.	UCO Bank	37,71,522.87
		23,98,81,684.71
	State Bank of India	3,99,60,426.43
	State Bank of Mysore	87.688.00
	State Bank of Indore	9,13,570.27
	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	8,83,261.12
	State Bank of Patiala	27,61,910.70
		18,47,129.00
	State Bank of Saurashtra	64,93,559.09
		28,63,35,670.23

'Claims amounting to Rs. 37.00 lakhs withdrawn by the bank

Debt Liabilities of Goa

*280. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tenth Finance Commission has refused to write off the debt liabilities of Goa incurred as a Union Territory;

(b) if so, the reasons therefore;

(c) whether the State Government of Goa is of the view that the debt liabilities are not payable by the State Government; and

(d) If so, what is the reaction of the Government thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKHARA MURTHY): (a) and (b) The Tenth Finance Commission has not recommended writing-off of the debt liabilities of Goa incurred as a Union Territory. It has, however, *vide* para 12.43 of its Report observed as follows:—

"The Government of Goa has stated that the loan liability of the erstwhile Union Territory of Goa, Daman and Diu has been placed entirely on Goa when it became a State. The State Government pleaded that the loan liability of Daman and Diu should be separated from the accounts of the State. We recommend that this matter may be examined and sattled by the Government of India as quickly as possible."

The matter regarding loan liabilities of erstwhile Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Goa on their becoming full fledged States in 1987 was looked into by the Ninth Finance Commission. The Ninth Finance Commission had recommended that the excess of Central loans received by each of these three States upto 1986-87, as Union Territories and outstanding as on 31.3.90, over what it would have received if, it had been a fullfledged State, be written off. The loans remaining outstanding, if any, after the above write off as on